

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Informalities

Claim 12 was objected to for improperly depending from claim 8. Claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 11, rather than claim 8. Therefore, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

II. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 6, 7 and 14-23 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Further, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the reference relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

It is also noted that claims 1-5 and 8-13 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ellis et al. (U.S. 2005/0028208). This rejection regarding claims 1-5 and 9 is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claim 1 and claims 2-5 and 8-13 that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a view programming system capable of programming a viewing of a show that a user wants to view. Further, claim 1 recites that a view programming apparatus transmits a first electronic mail including programmed show information prescribing the show, for which the viewing is programmed by the user, to be received by the show receiving apparatus. In addition, claim 1 recites that the show receiving apparatus receives the first electronic mail, and that the user selects whether to view or record the show, for which the viewing is programmed by the user, in accordance with the first electronic mail. Ellis fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features as recited in independent claim 1.

Rather, Ellis teaches that a reminder is sent to a user based on the user using a program guide to set the reminder, wherein the program for which the reminder is set is merely identified by the program guide and is not already set for recording (see Fig. 16 and paragraphs [0155] and [0156]).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Ellis merely teaches that a reminder is set by the user while viewing a list of programs to be broadcast, but fails to disclose or suggest that a view programming apparatus transmits a first electronic mail including programmed show information prescribing the show, for which the viewing is programmed by the user, to be

received by the show receiving apparatus, as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, although Ellis teaches that a reminder reminds a user of a show identified from a program guide, Ellis still fails to disclose or suggest that the show receiving apparatus receives the first electronic mail, and that the user selects whether to view or record the show, for which the viewing is programmed by the user, in accordance with the first electronic mail, as recited in claim 1.

In other words, because Ellis teaches that the program identified by the program reminder is not related to a show already programmed for viewing, Ellis fails to disclose or suggest that the show receiving apparatus receives the first electronic mail, and that the user selects whether to view or record the show, for which the viewing is programmed by the user, in accordance with the first electronic mail, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claims 2-5 and 8-13 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Ellis.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Ellis or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ellis to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-5 and 8-13 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection(s)

Claims 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of various combinations of Ellis (U.S. 2002/0174430) and Hiramoto et al. (U.S.

2003/0023987) (secondary references).

It is respectfully submitted that these secondary references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from Ellis reference.

Therefore, no obvious combination of Ellis with any of the secondary references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and claims 2-5 and 8-13 that depend therefrom.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroki MONTA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2008.12.17 14:31:32 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 17, 2008